

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

V.

ALFREDO CARRANZA, JR.,

Defendant.

2:11-cr-00012-LDG-RJJ

## ORDER

Defendant Alfredo Carranza filed a motion to suppress evidence obtained during a search of his vehicle (#11, response #17, reply #20, supplemental motion #29, supplemental objection #31). Based on these filings and a hearing, the magistrate judge recommended that this court deny Carranza's motion (#36). Carranza now objects to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation (#40, response #46, reply #47).

Among other things, Carranza objects to the magistrate’s conclusion that Officer Hawkins had reasonable suspicion based on an alleged violation of Nevada Revised Statutes § 484B.413. Carranza argues that a driver must only signal “if any other vehicle may be affected by such movement,” *Id.* § 484B.413(1), and that Officer Hawkins’ patrol car, the only other car in the vicinity, could not have been “affected by such movement” because it was approximately one-half of a block behind Carranza’s car. The report and recommendation rejected Carranza’s argument. That report, however, included an incomplete quotation of § 484B.413. *See* R&R [#36], at 3:21-23 (omitting “upon a highway” from the quoted statutory language). This court cannot adequately evaluate the recommendation to the extent it was based on the omission of potentially relevant statutory language. *Compare* Nev. Rev. Stat. § 484B.413 with Nev. Rev. Stat. § 484B.410. Accordingly,

1 THE COURT HEREBY REMANDS Carranza's motion to suppress (#11) for further  
2 report and recommendation in light of the foregoing order.

3

4 DATED this 86 day of October, 2011.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Lloyd D. George  
United States District Judge

